

REMARK/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, and 6-22 are presently active; Claims 1 and 8-22 having been amended by the present amendment.

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al (U.S. Patent 5,579,055) and Klosterman (U.S. Patent 5,940,073), hereinafter referred to as Klosterman '073, in view of Klosterman (U.S. Pat. No. 5,550,576) and Terasawa et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,147,714). Claims 11-14 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,548) in view of Terasawa et al.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection, the present amendment clarifies that the electronic program guide EPG data is altered (or added) *at the first broadcasting station* such that the EPG displays, with preference and within a row of the display that includes at least the provider tag and a program name, the provider tag of the first broadcasting station among a plurality of broadcasting stations. Applicants respectively submit that the claims are in compliance with Applicants' Figure 1 and the written description in the specification on pages 14 and 15, particularly the disclosure at the last paragraph starting on page 14, which states that a transmitting apparatus adds to an image signal, provider information and program information "from the broadcast station corresponding to the provider information so that the program information is emphasized."

Reply to Office Action dated July 7, 2004
Application No. 09/114,352

Klosterman '073 is cited in the outstanding Office Action for its teaching of promoting a program on a channel (in this case NBC).¹ However, there is no disclosure in Klosterman '073 that NBC is a broadcasting station that adds or alters EPG data, as the claims define that the alteration or addition occurs at the first broadcasting station. For Klosterman '073 to teach this feature of the present invention, preference would have to be given to the program guide provider, not NBC. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Klosterman '073 that NBC is a program guide provider. Indeed, one would suspect that NBC is not a program guide provider.

Hence, with no disclosure or suggestion in the applied prior art for preference to a first broadcasting station where EPG data is added or altered, it is respectfully submitted that the independent Claims 1 and 8-22, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably define over the applied prior art.

¹ Office Action, page 4, lines 15-16.

Reply to Office Action dated July 7, 2004
Application No. 09/114,352

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073
Attorney of Record
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618

CUSTOMER NUMBER
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413-2220

BDL:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\203593US\AM2.DOC